

SOLICITOR

AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

DEC 19 2008

| | |
|---|---|
| TO: Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 | REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK |
|---|---|

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been
filed in the U.S. District Court Northern District of California on the following ☒ Patents or ☐ Trademarks:

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| DOCKET NO. CV 08-05590 HRL | DATE FILED 12/16/2008 | U.S. DISTRICT COURT 280 South First Street, Rm 2112, San Jose, CA 95113 |
| PLAINTIFF MEDIMMUNE | | DEFENDANT PDL BIOPHARMA |
| PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO. | DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK | HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK |
| 1 5,585,089 | | SEE ATTACHED COMPLAIN |
| 2 5,693,761 | | |
| 3 5,693,762 | | |
| 4 6,180,370 | | |
| 5 7,022,500 | | |

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| DATE INCLUDED | INCLUDED BY <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Answer <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading | | |
| PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO. | DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK | HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK | |
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

| |
|--------------------|
| DECISION/JUDGEMENT |
|--------------------|

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| CLERK Richard W. Wieking | (BY) DEPUTY CLERK Betty Walton | DATE December 17, 2008 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Commissioner
Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 4—Case file copy

JEFFREY E. FAUCETTE (No. 193066)
Email: jfaucette@howardrice.com
HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY
FALK & RABKIN
A Professional Corporation
Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4024
Telephone: 415/434-1600
Facsimile: 415/217-5910

GERSON A. ZWEIFACH
PAUL B. GAFFNEY
AARON P. MAURER
DAVID I. BERL (No. 211761)
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-5901
Telephone: 202/434-5000
Facsimile: 202/434-5029

ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN
CARELLA, BYRNE, BAIN, GILFILLAN,
CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN, P.C.
Five Becker Farm Road
Roseland, New Jersey 07068-1739
Telephone: 973/994-1700
Facsimile: 973/994-1744

Attorneys for Plaintiff MEDIMMUNE, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MEDIMMUNE, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

PDL BIOPHARMA, INC.,

Defendant.

No.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
JUDGMENT OF PATENT INVALIDITY
AND CONTRACTUAL RIGHTS

1 **COMPLAINT**

2 Plaintiff MedImmune, LLC (f/k/a MedImmune, Inc.), by its attorneys, for its
3 Complaint, alleges as follows:

4 1. This is an action for declaratory relief pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
5 Procedure 57 and 28 U.S.C. §§2201. MedImmune seeks a declaration that U.S. Patent Nos.
6 5,585,089, 5,693,761, 5,693,762, 6,180,370, and 7,022,500 are invalid, and that
7 MedImmune owes no payments under a patent license agreement with PDL BioPharma, Inc.
8 (f/k/a Protein Design Labs, Inc.), ("PDL"), assignee of the patents.

9
10 **PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE**

11 2. Plaintiff MedImmune, LLC. ("MedImmune") is a biotechnology company with
12 its principal place of business in Gaithersburg, Maryland. MedImmune uses biotechnology
13 to develop and produce antibody therapies, including for the prevention of serious lower
14 respiratory tract disease caused by respiratory syncytial virus ("RSV") in vulnerable infants.

15 3. PDL is a biopharmaceutical company with its headquarters at 1400 Seaport
16 Blvd., Redwood City, CA. On information and belief, PDL is the assignee of United States
17 Patent Nos. 5,585,089, 5,693,761, 5,693,762, 6,180,370, and 7,022,500 (collectively, "the
18 PDL patents"), entitled Humanized Immunoglobulins, directed to, *inter alia*, certain
19 humanized antibodies and methods of preparing such antibodies. PDL is the successor-in-
20 interest of PDL BioPharma, Inc.

21 4. On information and belief, PDL's headquarters in Redwood City are its only
22 place of business in the United States.

23 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331, 1337,
24 1338(a), and 2201. This Court has jurisdiction over any state law claims asserted hereunder
25 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

26 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant PDL because the company
27 has its principal place of business in this district and, on information and belief, regularly
28 transacts business within this District in a substantial, continuous and systematic way.

1 7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391 and 1400(b),
2 because PDL has its principal place of business in this district, resides in this district and is
3 subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.
4

5 **BACKGROUND**

6 8. In 1997, PDL BioPharma, Inc., the predecessor-in-interest of PDL granted the
7 predecessor-in-interest of MedImmune a license to develop, manufacture, and sell anti-RSV
8 anti-bodies that would otherwise infringe a valid claim of certain patents of PDL, including
9 the PDL patents, in exchange for a royalty on sales of such products (hereinafter, "License
10 Agreement").

11 9. In the 1990s MedImmune developed the humanized antibody palivizumab for the
12 treatment of RSV. Palivizumab received FDA approval in 1998 and has been sold since
13 then under the trade name Synagis®. Since then MedImmune has made regular royalty
14 payments to PDL under the License Agreement on sales of Synagis®.

15 10. MedImmune has developed a next-generation anti-RSV antibody, motavizumab.
16 A Biologic License Application to market motavizumab for the prevention of lower
17 respiratory tract disease caused by RSV was filed by MedImmune in January 2008 and
18 accepted for filing as a standard application in March 2008. MedImmune has prepared
19 commercial quantities of motavizumab and expects to initiate marketing of this product upon
20 FDA approval.

21 11. PDL has taken the position that the PDL patents are valid and that both Synagis®
22 and motavizumab infringe the PDL patents.
23

24 **COUNT I—DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY**

25 12. MedImmune incorporates each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth
26 herein.

27 13. United States Patent No. 5,585,089 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103,
28 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double

1 patenting.

2 14. United States Patent No. 5,693,761 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103,
3 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double
4 patenting.

5 15. United States Patent No. 5,693,762 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103,
6 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double
7 patenting.

8 16. United States Patent No. 6,180,370 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103,
9 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double
10 patenting.

11 17. United States Patent No. 7,022,500 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103,
12 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double
13 patenting.

14 18. MedImmune hereby seeks a declaratory judgment that each of the PDL patents is
15 invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created
16 doctrine of obviousness type double patenting.

17
18 **COUNT II—DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF**
19 **CONTRACTUAL RIGHTS**

20 19. MedImmune incorporates each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth
21 herein.

22 20. Royalties are owed under the License Agreement for Synagis® and motavizumab
23 manufactured and sold in the U.S. only if the development, importation, manufacture, use, or
24 sale of Synagis® and/or motavizumab would, but for the License Agreement, infringe a
25 valid claim of the PDL patents.

26 21. Because the parties dispute whether Synagis® and motavizumab whether the
27 PDL patents are valid, an actual controversy exists between the parties concerning the rights
28 and obligations of MedImmune under the terms of the License Agreement.

1 22. MedImmune has no obligation to make payments to PDL under the License
2 Agreement pertaining to Synagis® or motavizumab that is manufactured and sold, because
3 Synagis® and motavizumab do not infringe any valid claim of the PDL patents. The basis
4 for invalidity of the PDL Patents arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C.
5 §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type
6 double patenting.

7 23. MedImmune hereby seeks a declaratory judgment that it owes no payments under
8 the License Agreement pertaining to Synagis® or motavizumab, that is manufactured and
9 sold in the United States, and that any payments made to PDL under the License Agreement,
10 post-dating this Complaint, based on sales of Synagis® or motavizumab, that is
11 manufactured, sold and used in the United States, are subject to the equitable powers of the
12 Court.

13
14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 WHEREFORE, plaintiff MedImmune requests that judgment be entered in favor of
16 MedImmune and against PDL and requests the following relief:

17 (a) A declaration that the PDL patents are invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102,
18 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting;

19 (b) A declaration that PDL is not entitled to any royalties on sales of Synagis®
20 and motavizumab that is manufactured and sold in the United States because the PDL
21 patents are invalid;

22 (c) A declaration that this is an exceptional case and an award of attorneys'
23 fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §285;

24 (d) Costs and expenses in this action; and
25
26
27
28

1 (e) Such further and other relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

2 DATED: December 15, 2008.

3 Respectfully,

4 GERSON A. ZWEIFACH
5 PAUL B. GAFFNEY
6 AARON P. MAURER
7 DAVID I. BERL
8 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

9 ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN
10 CARELLA, BYRNE, BAIN, GILFILLAN,
11 CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN, P.C.

12 JEFFREY E. FAUCETTE
13 HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY
14 FALK & RABKIN
15 A Professional Corporation

16 By: 

17 JEFFREY E. FAUCETTE

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff MEDIMMUNE, LLC

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
FALK
& RABKIN
A Professional Corporation